



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/415,177	03/08/2012	Doron LEHMANN	22135-0115001	9961

32864 7590 04/17/2017  
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. (SAP)  
PO BOX 1022  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
----------

BROMELL, ALEXANDRIA Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/17/2017

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* DORON LEHMANN and NIMROD BARAK

---

Appeal 2016-007398  
Application 13/415,177  
Technology Center 2100

---

Before JEFFREY S. SMITH, IRVIN E. BRANCH, and  
JOHN R. KENNY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BRANCH, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a rejection of claims 1, 3–8, 10–15, and 17–21. Claims 2, 9, and 16 are canceled. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

### CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claims are directed to optimizing enterprise portal searching.

Abstract.

Claim 1, reproduced below with the disputed limitations emphasized, is illustrative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A method, comprising:

*receiving, using at least one computer, a search request initiated from a user-accessed view of a navigation node;*

*ranking available search engines, the ranking based, at least in part, on an analysis of metadata received from the navigation node as context data and a comparison of the metadata received from the navigation node and metadata received from the available search engines;*

*receiving a selection of a search engine of the ranked available search engines and at least one search term, wherein a strength of a correlation between the metadata received from the navigation node and metadata received from the search engine is determined and recorded;*

recording context data associated with the received search engine selection and the at least one search term;

performing a search using the selected search engine and the at least one search term, wherein data is recorded whether additional broader or narrow searches based on the search term are performed on the same navigation node and whether the additional searches are associated with prior searches;

receiving search results; and

determining relevance of the returned search results.

## REFERENCES AND REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, and 19 stand rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Venkataraman (US 2014/0207749 A1; pub. July 24, 2014). Ans. 2–5.

Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, and 21 stand rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Venkataraman and Kim (US Patent 7,483,877 B2; iss. Jan. 27, 2009). Ans. 5–7.

## ANALYSIS

Appellants argue error in the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 because Venkataraman does not describe “an analysis of metadata received from the navigation node as context data,” “a comparison of the metadata received from the navigation node and metadata received from the available search engines,” and “receiving a selection of a search engine of the ranked available search engines and at least one search term, wherein a strength of a correlation between the metadata received from the navigation node and metadata received from the search engine is determined and recorded.” App. Br. 10–13; Reply Br. 2–5.

We are not persuaded of error in the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1. We adopt the Examiner’s findings and conclusion that claim 1 is anticipated by Venkataraman. Ans. 2–4; 7–11. We highlight the following primarily for emphasis.

The Examiner finds Venkataraman describes:

When the user types “psyc” into the search field, a suggested query refinement might be “psychiatry,” which is associated in a computer database with the “Medicine” category. If the WebMD search engine is also associated with this

category, the search system might provide a link that will launch the query “psychiatry” in the WebMD search engine. [¶ 68]

...

The system will compile a list of topical metadata categories associated with a refined query string, and then select search engines whose topical metadata categories overlap with this list. [¶ 76]

...

For example, one preferred system implementing the disclosed techniques might monitor and record the past selections of users of the system, and use this information to bolster the relevance of suggested query refinements. ... Selecting one of the search engine links will launch the refined query string in the selected search engine. [¶ 82]

Ans. 2–3 (citing Venkataraman ¶¶ 66, 68, 76, 82).

We are persuaded that claim 1’s “metadata received from the available search engines” reads on Venkataraman’s topical metadata associations in the database. The topic to which a search engine is associated in a database is metadata received from the search engine.

We are not persuaded of error based on Appellants’ arguments that “nothing in *Venkataraman* has been shown to teach or to suggest that ‘links’ provided by a search engine (see para. [0068]) are used in any way to choose a relevant search engine; only that the ‘link’ can be used to ‘launch the [user typed] query’.” Reply Br. 4. This argument is unpersuasive because using a link to a particular search engine to launch the query describes “receiving a selection of a search engine of the ranked available search engines and at least one search term,” as recited in claim 1. Moreover, “past selections of users of the system [are used] to bolster the relevance of suggested query refinements.” Venkataraman ¶ 82.

Accordingly, we see no error in the Examiner's rejection of claim 1.

Appellants argue claims 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, and 19 on the same bases as claim 1 and argue claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, and 21 on the basis that Kim does not remedy the deficiencies of Venkataraman. App. Br. 13; Reply Br. 5–6. Accordingly, we sustain the rejection of claims 3–8, 10–15, and 17–21.

#### DECISION

We affirm the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1, 3–8, 10–15, and 17–21.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED